

# EVANGELICAL INQUIRER.

{ NO. 8 }

DAYTON, OHIO:

MONDAY, JAN. 3, 1831.

{ VOL. I }

*"There is one body, and one Spirit, as also ye are called in one hope of your calling. One Lord, one Faith, one Baptism, one God and Father of all, who is over all, and with all, and in all Christians.—PAUL the Apostle.—McClurg's translation.*

## *From the Chapel Library.*

DR. COX ON REGENERATION.

DR. COX, a respectable Presbyterian minister of this city, preached a sermon before the Synod of New York, on the subject of regeneration, sometime last autumn. In this sermon, the Doctor commenced a bold and direct attack upon some of the leading doctrines of Calvinism. The sermon under consideration has been reviewed by the Princeton Biblical Repository, and by the New Haven Christian Spectator, both of which are regarded as orthodox periodicals. We have adverted to this subject for the purpose of showing that the work of reform is gradually progressing among the Presbyterians, and also to show that there is no such uniformity of sentiment among them, as a body, as many would suppose.

Dr. Cox says in his sermon:—

"One of the capital mistakes in theology, one that has been valued as a limb of orthodoxy, but which may well be viewed as the great paralyser of preaching, is that of the alleged passivity of the subject in regeneration. This mistake has been adopted superficially, from a dark and technical regard to the doctrine of election and its kindred truths: by false principles of interpretation, since the Bible teaches no such doctrine, and with an officious care to exclude all self-complacency from Christians. But error and ignorance correct nothing, and our grand weapon of warfare is truth. Now if it be a fact that the soul is just as active in regeneration as in any other thing—as it is before or after that glorious event—then, what shall we call that kind of orthodoxy that proposes to make men better by

teaching them the reverse? To paralyze the soul, or to strike it through with a moral panic, is not regeneration. But to bring it to "hear the word of Christ, and believe on him that sent him," and so to pass (or, as we prefer to render it, to make transition) "from death unto life," this is regeneration."—p. 24.

"If it be said that the Spirit of God produces regeneration, I answer, True; but what is regeneration? Is it something done to the subject, and not done *by* him? This view will, I know, quadrature with some technicalities of the books; I know, also, that it is technically wretched, philosophically wrong, and theologically false."—p. 25.

"Perhaps it will be said that God creates or inserts some *holy principle* in us, which constitutes regeneration, and in which we are entirely passive; but that thereafter we actively do our duty. I reply, that it can command the confidence of no well-disciplined mind. By "*holy principle*," I mean love to God, and not any thing *antecedent* to it; and by love to God, I mean *loving him*; and in that the subject is active. In short there is no such thing as a holy principle antecedent to it; or distinguishable from, *active, mental holiness*."—p. 26.

To this the Princeton reviewers reply:—

"We do not see how it is possible to hold together the tattered shreds of Calvinism, if this ground be assumed.—p. 266. We are at a loss to see how this theory is to be reconciled with the Calvinist's doctrine of the will.—p. 277. That the denial of the sinner's blindness to the holiness of God is involved in it, is perfectly evident.—p. 285. Dr. Cox asks whether it is not "*intrinsically absurd*," that a man should be regenerated before he does his duty? We think the absurdity is all the other way, that he should do his duty without being regenerated.—p. 286. Dr. Cox speaks of this "*certain kind of principle*," as a mysterious gratuity with which the receiver has nothing to do. We are persuaded that a *fundamental* difference, as

to the nature of *agency*, and *human liberty*, lies at the foundation of all such objections. We are yet *fighting in the dark*. The real turning point is yet in the back ground."—p. 287.

"The truth is, that the whole system is a forced and unnatural union between *Arminian* philosophy and Calvinistic facts; a union which can neither be peaceful nor lasting.—p. 192. That this principle [*i. e.* moral character belonging only to acts of choice] is inconsistent with the doctrine of original righteousness, is formally admitted. That it involves the denial of original sin, as the doctrine has been commonly held among Calvinists, is equally clear. According to the prevalent doctrine on this subject, original sin consists, first, in the imputation of Adam's sin; this, it seems, *has been long exploded*: secondly, in the want of original righteousness; *this is gone too*; for there never was any such thing; and thirdly, in the corruption of nature, that is, a tendency to do what God has prohibited, [and nothing else,] existing *prior* to all acts of choice, and independently of them; and *and now this is gone*."—p. 292. [Alas! for the tattered shreds of Calvinism!]

"But to return to our subject. This theory not only overthrows the doctrines which we have just mentioned, but it throws the Spirit's influences almost out of view. We think the grace of God acts a part scarcely more conspicuous in all this scheme, than it does in the enumeration of the titles of a European monarch."—p. 294. "As to the point which Dr. Cox thinks so *"intrinsically absurd,"* and about which he says so much, whether man is *passive* in regeneration, it will be seen that, for its own sake, *it does not merit a moment's discussion*. It depends entirely on the previous questions; whether there is not a holy *"relish,"* taste, or *principle* produced in the soul *prior*, in the order of nature, to any holy act of the soul itself. To relinquish this point will cost us a struggle. It will be giving up the main point of debate between the friends and opposers of the *doctrines of grace*, from Augustine

to the present day. We have no doubt Dr. Cox believes these doctrines. What we lament is, that he should seem to advocate a principle which we fear is *subversive of them all*.—p. 295, 296, 297.

Such is the language by which the Princeton reviewers rebuke Dr. Cox, and those who agree with him in sentiment. But the reviewers of New Haven speak of Dr. Cox's sermon in very different terms. After eulogizing him as "a powerful preacher," and representing the question at issue as "the most important in the whole range of christian theology," the reviewer says, "Perhaps the solution of this single question may be the pivot on which shall turn whole systems of divinity; the radiating point, from which may shoot off rays into whole regions of surrounding twilight and midnight darkness. After quoting such scriptures as these, '*Seek and ye shall find,*' '*Come unto me, and I will give you rest,*' they ask,

"Now, in reading these passages—and they have reference to the very point in debate, the commencement of religion in the soul;—would it ever occur that they regarded man in any other light than as being *active* in the entire work of religion? Do they look as if the sacred penman ever considered their minds as mere *passive* recipients in any part of this work? Do they not speak as men do on other subjects when they express activity? And is not the natural language of these expressions, that the mind is as far as possible from stagnation, or torpor, or '*moral panic*?' Let it be remembered also, that they speak of the actings of the mind in *all* the changes which it experiences in religion. There is nothing in the charge of which they speak, *anterior* to action; no department of the moral man in which christianity obtains a lodgment, that is not expressed by language describing man's own agency."—p. 380.

Again, we should not probably agree with them in their views of election, yet we can heartily subscribe to the language which they use in controversy with

the "old Calvinists;" language that would have sounded strangely in Presbyterian ears a few years ago.

"What is the doctrine of election, on the theory of our opponents? That a part of mankind are taken to eternal life, in consequence of a change of heart, in which they had no share. That the remainder sink to hell for wanting *that which did depend upon themselves*—for wanting "a holy principle" distinct from, and independent of, any act of their own—and for wanting *influence of God*, by which such a principle is created in the breast of the redeemed! With exactly the same justice might any man be condemned to perdition for wanting talents, beauty or wealth. These are the representations of the doctrine of election, which have made it so odious in many parts of our land. Every principle of man's nature rises up against such statements. They make the whole system of the doctrines of grace a loathing and an abhorrence to thousands. They steel the hearts of multitudes against the influence of divine truth. Other multitudes they place in the attitude of *passive recipients*, waiting for some mysterious gift distinct from their own agency. With entire respect, and with personal affection for many who make these statements, we are compelled to say, that, in our view, they take upon themselves a tremendous responsibility in so doing. Woe to that minister of God, who, in his name, proclaims to men to wait in the solemn duties of their souls, for the expected aid of the Almighty, or to delay the effort for repentance till he shall send them new powers or principles of action from on high. In all the oracles of truth not one such direction is found."—p. 357.

We shall make one more quotation from the Reviewer at New Haven, for the purpose of giving the views which the conductors of that periodical hold respecting faith. They are precisely those which we entertain ourselves on this subject:—

"When we look at faith, without reference to any

theological debate, we see nothing that is particularly mysterious about it as an operation of the mind; nothing which by any inherent properties separates it from the usual actings of moral agency. It is belief in testimony; that is, credit given to truth, according to evidence, implying *action* in looking at this evidence, and in coming to the result. In all this we see only the actings of the mind. Take away that *act of mind*—the *putting forth* of confidence, trust, or belief, and what remains? There is nothing tangible or conceivable, but the act of the mind. A child puts confidence in a parent's promise. This is faith. He relies on him in the hour of danger; he fears when he threatens. That is also faith. But besides this act of mind in the child, there is nothing that can be detected or conceived of in relation to the subject, that deserves praise or blame. So of the christian. All that we know of this crowning christian grace is, that the man believes, hopes, loves, fears, puts trust in God."

"But it is said that faith is the gift of God. This is true. And so are repentance, love, hope, and peace, the gift of God, and in the same sense, and to the same extent. The passage of scripture which says, "For by grace are you saved through faith, and that not of yourselves; it is the gift of God," may perhaps be objected to the view here given. But it should be remembered that while the sentiment which *appears* to be taught there is true, it is not the truth which *that* passage contains. In the original the word "*that*" refers not to *faith*, but to the *salvation by grace*. It would be correctly rendered, "You are saved by grace through faith, and this *salvation by grace* through faith is not of yourselves, it is the gift of God"—a sentiment not asserting any thing peculiar in the gift of faith above other graces."

"To this view of faith we know there is presented a difficulty in the technicalities of some systems of theology, drawn we believe from erroneous views of the philosophy of the mind. It is, that anterior to the

exercise of faith, apart from it, and capable of distinct contemplation, and of course responsibility, there is a *principle* of faith implanted in regeneration. This is the counterpart of the doctrine of physical depravity; of a concreated principle of evil; and is what cannot be admitted as true."—p. 333, 354.

The foregoing quotations are sufficient to show that the work of reform is still in progress among the Presbyterians,—that the standard of orthodoxy is gradually lowering; and that a more liberal and rational system of theology is prevailing among them; and we are confident that it must continue to prevail. The dogmas of Calvinism, even among Presbyterians, are becoming unpopular, and must, ere long, sink to rise no more. This controversy is also an additional evidence to prove that the boasted power of creeds to preserve uniformity of faith in a religious body, is but the mere artifice of sectarians to urge the claims of partyism, and that creeds in reality possess no such power; for there always has, and must continue to be, a variety of sentiments on religious subjects in the same body. From the force of education, from the degrees of knowledge which have been acquired, from the accustomed modes and habits of thinking which have been adopted, and from our constitutional temperament which is but partially understood, the light of truth shining upon the understanding under these various influences, produces different shades of reflections. From hence we argue that creeds are entirely powerless to preserve uniformity of faith, any further than they dispose persons to take things on trust; and so far as they do this, they are prejudicial to vital christianity.

---

#### SUNDAY MAILS—No. I.

Recently several requests have been presented to some of my friends and to myself for the republication of the "Substance of a discourse on the Sabbath," delivered by myself some nine or ten months since. Others have requested me to write on the subject of "Sun-

day mails." The latter I design doing. I am decidedly of the opinion that the present opposition to this regulation of the post office department, is religiously and politically incorrect. My opinion is an honest one, and others may honestly differ from me. And as there are some of this place strongly opposed to the regulations of Government on this subject, an opportunity now offers for a friendly and thorough discussion. On account of my sentiments touching this point, I have already been counted erroneous; and notwithstanding my youth and inexperience in writing may make me an easy captive for the "petitioners," I am willing that it should be *proved* that I am erroneous, (if possible) and now offer my columns for the discussion, properly conducted. I am not over anxious for opposition in form of debate or otherwise; but as I intend saying something on the subject, I wish it understood that this paper is not surrounded with pulpit life-guards, but that it can report arguments upon both sides of a question.

This subject should be considered both in its religious and political relations. It concerns both politics and religion and the discussion will embrace a wider field than many are aware of. The terms of a question should always be settled before debate, otherwise the point will be intangible and the discussion terminate in mere verbosity. This question generally is framed thus: "Ought the mails to run on the Sabbath?" Now this embraces a previous question, what is meant by Sabbath? If it is answered the first day of the week is Sabbath, two errors are unavoidable; first, the true christened name of the last day of the week is given to the first: and second, the point of the petitioners is surrendered, for their prayer to congress is predicated upon the sanctity of the Sabbath. If on the other hand it is answered that the Sabbath is the day instituted by the Jewish law for worship, again two errors are inevitable; first, the petition prays for the sanctification of the christian instead of the Jewish worship day;

and second, the petitioners by their memorial constitute themselves Jews and lay themselves under obligation to be circumcised and to keep the whole law of Moses.

After much reflection I am convinced that but two causes can be justly assigned for this recent, simultaneous and concerted movement throughout the States. The one (and the one of most general influence) is the prevailing misapprehension of the import and genius of christianity, confounding its ennobling spirituality with the servile routine of the Hebrew theology. The other, with influence less general, yet not less powerful, is the disposition manifest among the prominent and aspiring priesthood of every age, to get power under the watchword of their profession, "the service of God." I do not say that all or near the sum totum of the clergy engaged in this crusade of the nineteenth century are governed by such motives, but certainly no disinterested person can exonerate the whole fraternity. It is to be hoped that the ignorance and crime of the un-holy crusades are not to be displayed at so late a day—so near the breaking forth of millennial light. But as "the darkest hour is before day," we may have sad times yet.

The pivot of this controversy is, whether the fourth commandment is the rule of christians with reference to holy time; or in other words, whether it is right to plead the Jewish law in favor of the religious observance of the first day of the week. This is the naked question. Let him take the affirmative who can.

*Let the prayer of the petitioners be granted and judaism is established by law.* I prove this assertion by observing that in both Testaments, the Old and the New, the word Sabbath invariably designates the seventh day or Saturday, the observance of which as a day of rest, was peculiar to the Jews and was the core of their system. In no case in holy writ is the first or any but the seventh day of the week called the Sabbath. It is plead by the "petitioners" that the Holy Scriptures

enjoin the sanctification of the Sabbath, therefore the existing regulation of the mails is an infraction of the divine law and an oppressive example of religious intolerance. Now while praying congress to establish a scriptural Sabbath, in what will their efforts, if successful, terminate, but the reorganization and re-enactment of abrogated Judaism? Let the candid judge.

If this difficulty does not alarm the "petitioners," we will show them another belonging to their project. Suppose congress should show them favor, and make such regulations as would be thought sufficient safeguards of the Sabbath by the petitioners, the new laws, (like all our laws) would awaken the inventive powers of speculators in order to their advantage. Among the crowds of the dominant sects in Christendom pressing with avidity after the *golden* prize, mayhap the Jews and Sabbatarians would be found urging their claims. Here we would have a theological debate and a political squabble. In theology, if not in politics, the Jews would be victorious, for they can prove that Sabbath is Saturday from both Testaments. But I presume our "petitioners" would not be at a loss; for they could memorialize or petition congress again, for of old the "earth helped the woman." But though the memorialists might not be at a loss, congress would be; for they would now be called upon to decide this theological dispute and award the political advantage as their predilections might dictate. This would be making congress an ecclesiastical body as plainly as though it were metamorphosed into a college of cardinals.

In no way can we approach, in no attitude can we view this subject, in which the fallacy of our opponents' reasonings is not obvious. How long will the honest be duped! How long will the interested presumptuous seek to deceive! Americans, christians, examine.

In compliance with request I now subjoin the following extract of "*the substance of an extemporaneous discourse,*" delivered by myself and above alluded to.

## SUBSTANCE OF A DISCOURSE, &amp;c.

Acts—20 ch. 6 7 verses. *We came \* \* to Troas \* \* where we abode seven days. And upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached."*

"We read this short passage, not as a text, upon which we design founding our observations, without reference to its connexions and dependencies, but to introduce an important subject, in the discussion of which we will have to refer to many other passages of the Jewish and Christian scriptures. Our evening's work will be, an attempt to make a developement of the truths involved in these two questions:—1st. Is the first day of the week, on which christians assemble for worship, the Sabbath! And 2ndly, What is the basis of institution and design contemplated by the observance of the Lord's day?

We are sensible that we are entering upon a delicate subject, a subject upon which public excitement and feeling run high. The views which we are about to state and advocate, have been the subject of much reprehension and vituperation. Yet this does not deter us from harboring or expressing them. Though they may have been loaded with such honorable epithets as Deism and Infidelity, by those who ought to know better, but perhaps do not, yet, confident that they are scriptural, and sensible of their tendency to elevate the mind above the thralldom of religious oppression and superstition, we respectfully submit them for your consideration,

Upon the first question we take this position;—that there is as much authority for calling the first day of all the fifty-two weeks in the year Christmas, as there is for calling the same day the Sabbath. The fourth commandment, "remember the Sabbath day," &c. is the alleged authority for the observance of the Sabbath, In that memorable command, one day out of the seven that constitute the week, is devoted by the Almighty as a holy day and a day of rest. And this is not all.

The seventh in order is the day marked out in the definitive terms and provisions of the law. No day of the week would answer the demands of this law respecting suppression of labor and religious rest, but the seventh, which is Saturday. The Jews and Sabbatarians who meet on Saturday, are the only persons who approach to consistency in the observance of the Sabbath. We do not know by what rule, a law that sanctifies the seventh, which is the last day in the week, can, in the same terms, consecrate the first day, unless it be in conformity with this passage, "the last shall be first!!" But to all this it is objected, that the Lord merely set apart a seventh part of time for religious service, and any day will answer; also that he has changed the Sabbath from the seventh to the first day. This objection our preceding remarks have measurably anticipated. We again observe that the seventh day is definitely designated, and the reason for its appointment assigned. We will read from the law. Exodus, 20th chapter, 10th and 11th verses—"The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God—for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested on the seventh day." Until it can be proved that God rested from his labors on the first day of creation, this objection will amount to "*vox et præterea nihil*"—a mere sound. Will opposers show the passage in the new Covenant that intimates the change of days in religious observance? If they cannot, why do they assert it as a truth. Give the restless spirit of innovation the liberty to remodel one of God's institutions, and where would we find a stopping place to the work of religious desolation and demolition?

Thus far, in our humble opinion, we have succeeded. That Saturday was the Sabbath, we have clearly shown, but my friendly hearers, we design going further. We shall now prove, that eighteen hundred years ago the Sabbath was entirely abolished. Let us not be misunderstood. We as religiously abstain from labor on Sunday, as our neighbors, and keep it as de-

voutly as we can, but at the same time, we assume, and shall prove, that the Jewish Sabbath has been done away. There are in the scriptures many compacts or institutions, called covenants; but there are two, which, owing to their peculiar character and importance, are called the *Old and New Covenants*, which distinctive appellations equally mark their arrangement in the order of priority and glory. The Apostle Paul, in the Epistle to Hebrews, 8th chapter, quoting from Jeremiah, observes, that God, finding fault with the Jews and the first Covenant which he gave them when he led them out of Egypt, would at a future period make a new and different covenant. Now this message from God was delivered by Jeremiah, the Seer of Israel, 600 years before the christian era. God then had determined upon the demolition of the Jewish covenant or constitution. Paul argued that from its very name "*old covenant*," it was ready to vanish away in the prophet's time, and that he had lived to see it dead and buried, and the new institution erected, with Jesus at its head. Now we assert that this old Covenant was the decalogue, or ten commandments. In other words, that the fourth commandment was a part of that covenant that was done away, and consequently that the Sabbath was abolished. Of this we shall offer some proof. In the first place, the *commandments* answer to the description of the old covenant. They were given to the Jews when God led them out of Egyptian bondage—Heb. 8 ch. 9 v. Again, the ten commandments, written on stone, were placed in a box or ark, which, from the sacred deposit it contained, was called the Ark of the Covenant. But in addition to all this, we have the express declaration of the scriptures to this effect, See Exodus, 34—28. "And he wrote upon the tables the words of the covenant, the ten commandments." From the passages quoted, two things are fully proved—that the decalogue was the Jewish covenant, and that this covепant expired at the setting up of the Christian in-

stitution. This admitted, and the conclusion is irresistible—we have no Sabbath in our day. But there are other evidences which we must not omit. There appears in the fourth command, no adaptation to the circumstances of the human family. Indeed it is worse than this, it would be destructive to those who live in northern latitudes. It was altogether suitable for the Jews, who lived in a warm climate, and who owed so much to the immediate interposition of heaven. The law we refer to, reads thus, Exodus xxxv. 2 & 3. “Whosoever doeth work on the Sabbath day shall be put to death. Ye shall kindle no fire throughout your habitations upon the Sabbath day.” There are good reasons for all God’s laws, but admitting we were under this regulation, how could we live? to obey it would be the death of all young children every winter, and to disobey it, would be to execute the same penalty upon the whole community. To suppose that we are bound to keep the Sabbath, is to say that God has given us a law that necessarily issues in death,—a law that frowns into the grave, alike the obedient and disobedient. There is no license in the Jewish law for works of necessity on the Sabbath.

But again. So far from its being true that we Gentiles are under the law or ten commands, no Gentile was ever required to obey them. Neither Moses nor the Prophets, Christ nor the Apostles enjoined the Sabbath upon the uncircumcised. Indeed Jesus never recommended its observance to any one, Jew or Gentile. The very preamble to the ten Jewish commandments, shows that the whole code was the exclusive constitution of a nation, whose defence conducted by their mighty preserver, the *Omnipotent*, was signalized by the most stupendous miracles. It reads thus: “I am the Lord thy God, which have brought thee out of the Land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage.” We have been astonished at the remarkable fecundity of genius displayed by the moderns, in coining words and instituting observances that entirely originated

with themselves. This morbid appetite for innovation was concerned in the manufacture of the name, *Christian Sabbath*,—a name that has no archetype, but in the misconceptions of those who framed it.

But it is inquired, do you leave us without a holy day? Permit us to repeat here some words of the inspired Saulus Paul. Col. ii. 16, 17—"Let no man judge you in respect of a holy day, of the new moon, or of the Sabbath days, which are a shadow of things to come." Now to the question, we will answer, that all days to the enlightened christian are alike holy. To him it is a crime to sin on any day, and he is as religious on Saturday as he is on Sunday. But yet is there no day which may emphatically be called the Lords, and which should be especially dedicated to his service? Yes, this day, whose sun has just declined below the western horizon—the first day of the week once witnessed an event, at the remembrance of which it always rejoices. Every week it sings its hymns of praise on the resurrection of the Son of God. It relates the story of the disbanding of death, the grave disrobed and the path of immortality enlightened—the ladder of glory arising from the grave and embracing the battlements of heaven, in its ascent. Who that believes and knows the meaning of that day does not feel himself ennobled and his faculties exalted, when, at its recurrence, he contemplates the basis of its institution—the resurrection of Jesus.

We are now considering the second question proposed at the outset of our discourse. The early christians at first assembled daily for worship, Acts ii. 46: but they had bodies as well as souls, and their mortal as well as immortal interests were to be regarded. It was natural for them before dispersing to attend to their various avocations, to appoint a time for re-assembling. To follow common custom and make Saturday, the Sabbath, the stated day of meeting, would have been to merge again into Judaism. By such an act, they would have been building up again that which

their leader had destroyed. Several reasons concurred in determining the primitive christians in their observing the first day of the seven as the object of their choice. The primary reason, to which we have already adverted, was, that Jesus rose from the dead on that blessed morning. Another, and one of considerable importance, is, that after his resurrection, and prior to his ascension to heaven, Jesus usually met with them on that day, and thus authorized them to assemble regularly at that particular time to meet him in attendance upon the institutions and duties of his house.

\* \* \* \* \*

There is that which is equivalent to a divine requirement—approved example and an actual necessity for christians to abstain from labor, and congregate for public worship on the Lord's day. But although we thus express ourselves, we would be distinctly understood, that we have no idea that God needs the secular arm to enforce his laws. He conducts the affairs of the universe either by his own immediate influence, or by those institutions and powers that he has established. He has erected an order of society, called the Church of Christ, entirely dissimilar from any other body in the world. This congregation he has invested with full power to enforce many of his laws upon its own members, and also to control society to a certain extent, by the influence of their example, the purity of their practice, and the exalting tendency of their hopes and sentiments. Further than this they have no right to go. The law of Messiah's reign is the law of love. The christian's course must be the policy of peace. Even when his subjects are rebellious, the king in Zion, for the present, suspends a final decision upon their case; and while they are upon the earth, though they are his enemies, he causes his sun to shine upon them as he does upon the good. Christianity is founded upon truth, a rock that stands much stronger than the mountain of civil power. Its engines are demonstration and persuasion, weapons much more puissant than

an act of congress, or fire and faggot. The former can control soul, body and spirit—can immortalize the whole man. The latter, when engaged in the defence of religion, can only command the obedience of the unwilling slave, who crouches merely because he fears, while the feelings of his soul are unmoved, and his service is deceitful. To our apprehension, the spirited efforts now making to secure the aid of the civil law in defence of what is improperly called the Sabbath, betray very erroneous conceptions of the Kingdom of Christ. It was his invariable policy to mark an obvious line of distinction between his own and the empire of Cæsar. "My kingdom is not of this world." "Render to Cæsar the things that are his, and to God the things that are God's." Such are his decisions. To say that we effect no union between Church and State, while we receive the aid of civil power in religion, is about as logical as to affirm that we form no alliance with the empire of beef and butter, while these are among the articles of our common diet.

In reference to the transportation of the mails on Sunday, there is, in our opinion, in circulation an egregious mistake in point of fact. It is generally asserted that congress has fixed the carriage of the mails on that day by law. But this is not true. Congress has never legislated upon the subject. The time of running the mails is determined by the Executive of the Post Office Department. He should be memorialized, and not our National Legislature, when new regulations are to be effected within the limits of his jurisdiction. It then follows that all that has been said about the oppression of congress, has originated in the fearful apprehensions and mistaken zeal of its opposers. But let us look at the subject in another light. Ours is a government of such a liberal cast, that every religious sentiment is tolerated that does not lead to disorderly conduct. The civil and religious rights of all are respected. The Jewish synagogue and Christian place of worship are alike sacred. Now suppose that the de-

scendants of Israel should pray congress to re-enact the Mosaic law with reference to Saturday, their Sabbath; suppose they should quote Genesis, Exodus and Leviticus, Moses and the Prophets in their favor—that congress should hear them and decree that no fire should be kindled and no intelligence circulated on Saturday? Who would blame the now zealous petitioners, for remonstrating with the government—for telling their rulers that they could not live in the company of chilling frost, cold hearths and smokeless chimneys? Would they not be justifiable in saying that “before congress interferred in a matter that does not concern them, we were happy because we were equal?” This is the true state of the case. *If Government does any thing in this matter, our National Council becomes Umpire between religious disputants, sides with one party and exalts their interests over the rights of the remainder of the community. This would not be an union of religion and politics, but it would be supporting sectarianism by the civil law.* Christianity has but one request to make of Government. We will frame that request in the words of the eccentric Diogenes, addressed to Alexander the Great, when lounging in his tub in the open air—“just stand out of my sunshine.”

Before entirely dismissing this subject, to prevent a misunderstanding of our meaning, we will offer some additional remarks upon the abolition of the ten commands. The whole Jewish peculiarity moral, ceremonial and typical, called usually in the New Testament, *the law*, was fulfilled, honored and abrogated by Christ. To this it is objected, then it is no longer a crime to commit idolatry, steal, &c. This by no means follows. We say that a newspaper published twenty years ago, is out of date, that it ceases to be a *newspaper*, yet by so doing, we do not affirm that the principles it advocated, or the intelligence it reported, were either erroneous or false. Thus, though the old covenant is done away, its moral principles cannot be annihilated, but are actually re-enacted and embraced

in the new and better instrument, called the new covenant. The Jews were under law to Moses; Christians are under law to Christ. The Old Testament is as much the word of God as the New is, but because Abraham lived in tents, we do not conceive that the citizens of Dayton are under obligations to encamp upon the public ground when they have good houses to live in. Upon the same principle we do not obey Moses because the Israelites did. Jesus is our leader, before whom Moses and Elijah, the heads of the Legislative and Prophetic departments humbly resigned their offices upon Mount Tabor."

Other arguments I am prepared to present, if necessary, in defence of the proposition, the Jewish law is not good authority with Christians, in reference to the religious observance of the first day of the week.

EDITOR

---

#### EXPOSITION—No. I.

A subscriber from Indiana, in a letter containing some encouraging tidings, makes the following request: "Dear Brother, you observed in your fifth No. page 101, 'the living word means what it says, or it means nothing at all.' I do not dispute your opinion, but would ask you to give in your next, for the satisfaction of many, your opinion of Matt. xxiii. from the 1st to the 41st verse inclusive." As there are but thirty-nine divisions (called verses,) in the above named chapter, I presume our correspondent must mean the first 14 verses of the chapter, which 41 will make transposed.

My observation in the 5th No. of this volume and alluded to above, I still hold to be correct. I cannot conceive of a revelation unrevealed, nor can our correspondent; but let it be observed that language is used literally and figuratively, and that in most of our sentences, when analyzed, are found many figurative words. In some sentences we find many figurative words and also the whole sentence taken together ma-

king but one entire figure. Figurative words and sentences are to be figuratively explained; that is, the figure is first to be explained as a figure and then it is to be explained as applicable to the subject. Of literal sentences we are to give the literal meaning. This is done in all languages, by all people; and by this rule all books are interpreted. The vagaries of our mystics and spiritualizers form perhaps the only exception. The chapter alluded to is full of forcible figures.

I shall now proceed to give my opinion, in a paraphrase, of the passage, using other words to illustrate those employed in the sacred text. The circumscribed limits I have necessarily assigned myself for this exposition must render the paraphrase incomplete. Indeed I promise nothing but hints to assist those who may study the passage. In the context, Jesus was encountered by the Pharisees, Scribes, Herodians, (politicians) and Sadducees. In this chapter he describes the character of the Scribes and Pharisees.

**THE SCRIBES** were those who before the art of printing was introduced, made it their business to transcribe on vellum or parchments, all books and manuscripts. It was the trade of many of these, to increase the number of copies of the Jewish scriptures, which they did with great accuracy, counting all the sentences, words, syllables and letters of each copy. Their acquaintance with the law and prophets necessarily became very intimate and great dignity and sanctity attached itself to their persons. This profession became very corrupt and they did much to oppress the people by their spurious interpretations of the books they transcribed.

**THE PHARISEES**, (or separatists, as their name imports) were originally, in all probability, as pure a politico-ecclesiastic society as the nature of the case would admit, but, as many popular societies of the day, became as corrupt as Jesus represents them. This order (the pharisees) was formed of eminent and learned men in the midst of great corruption; and its ob-

ject was the extraordinary holiness of its members. As they gained respect they gave way to every excess, not however relaxing the severity of their discipline. The order at last became nothing but a *profession*. The first Pharisees were in high estimation for their teaching, but their successors adopted and reiterated their dogmas, now became fashionable, while their practice was below the most common standard of morality.

PARAPHRASE. Matt. 23 ch. The Scribes and Pharisees, being by custom rulers of synagogues and religious teachers, sit in the chair of Moses, your great lawgiver and judge: therefore as far as they teach the doctrine of Moses from his seat, upon due conviction of its truth yield obedience with a willing mind; (this is "observing and doing"). But I charge my disciples and the multitude not to follow their example, for they teach others that which they do not observe themselves. Instance one specification; they require of the people the most exact conformity, not only all the minutiae of the law, but also to all their other traditional and original commandments and doctrines, while they, considering themselves the privileged order, do not go to the trouble of doing the works of supererogation by which they oppress the people. Nay, said the Saviour, they will not so much as lift a finger to help bear the burdens they have imposed upon the shoulders of others. Indeed when they perform an action, in itself good, their object is to be praised by men. In order to appear eminently holy they increased the dimensions of their phylacteries, so that the sentences of the law written upon them should be visible to every one and their superior holiness confessed. For the same purpose they have increased the number and size of the *fringes* Moses ordered the Israelites to wear upon their garments, that thus the most diabolic practices might be concealed under the fairest appearances and most holy pretences.\* It is for like reasons that they are pleased to be distinguished at public en-

tertainments, by a particular seat in your synagogues or meeting houses; and salutations expressive of their dignity in public places, and to hear men address them with the epithet Rabbi (or my teacher). Such is the character of these dignitaries who have abused the confidence of the people. But my disciples, assume not the title Rabbi, for that would be interfering with my prerogative; and be careful to style no man father in religion, as God is your father, and among you there is perfect equality—ye are brethren. Let it be understood that such are the principles, under which you are to act, that I, the Messiah, am to be the only christian leader and that humility and utility shall alone exalt any one in the estimation of his brethren.

But wo to you Scribes and Pharisees, whom I denominate hypocrites, because keeping the key of knowledge in your own hands, obscuring my testimonies and my claims to a kingdom, you make the people reject me and thus close the only access to the heavenly kingdom I am about to organize, so that while you will not enter yourselves, you are preventing thousands of others by your influence. So powerful is the unhallowed prejudice you can raise.

“I pronounce a wo upon you, because you are devouring the substance of widows and the rights of orphans, by the contributions your affected piety has drawn from them. Your long prayers† (sometimes three hours in speaking) intended as a disguise of your enormities, will only heighten your already aggravated punishment.”

Such is the expository paraphrase I offer of this passage, my limits forbidding any more extended observations at present. But should my respected correspondent mean to request, by his letter, the exposition of any other part or the whole of this chapter, upon his signifying it, I will be pleased to do any service of which I am capable.

EDITOR.

---

\*The phylacteries were pieces of parchment or vel-

lum, one or two inches broad and long enough to go around the head, worn upon the forehead, with remarkable sentences inscribed upon them. They at once represented singular devotion to God and were used as amulets or safeguards against all maladies. Moses required the *fringes* or *borders* to be worn that the number of threads might remind the wearer of the numerous laws of God. See Numbers xv. 38, 39.

It is supposed that the Pharisees, like the Roman clergy, were in the habit of selling their prayers, that is, they offered prayers for individuals, on consideration of a stipulated remuneration.

---

#### INQUIRIES—No. VI.

What will be the ground of the condemnation of wicked men and their deeds at the last day? Ans. The wickedness of their doings.

Will men be condemned for not doing that which they were unable to do? Let any one answer. I know many *infer* the affirmative from their own reasonings on the scriptures, but where is the passage that embodies the sentiment? I challenge the ability of our opponents to show it.

Is not the remedial system of Jesus Christ designed to prepare men to sustain the judgment with honor and safety?

To these I add a fourth query; it is as follows: Will not a proper answer to these inquiries, sustain the assertion that, men with the means afforded in the christian religion, are able and should be exhorted by those that teach the gospel, to do those things that will secure their salvation?

EDITOR.

---

**NOTE.** By the length of two or three articles in this No., considerable other matter, waiting for the press, was excluded. It will appear in our next.

---

*THE INQUIRER* is edited by D. S. BURNET Price \$1 00 in advance, or \$1 50 after six months. Letters post-paid